

Remarks

Claims 1-7, 13-15, and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Dutta et al. Claim 16 was rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta in view of Imoto.

Claims 1-7, 13-15, and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Dutta et al. In response, these claims were amended to better recite what the Applicants regard as their invention. In particular, independent claims 1 and 13 were amended to include the limitations that a textual input area comprises both a word entry area and a character entry area, both adapted to receive handwritten entries.

As discussed in the Background of the Invention, a user may input both handwritten text (e.g., words) or handwritten characters (e.g., email addresses). Natural handwriting recognition (HWR) programs have been developed to recognize handwritten words. Users, however, often need to write otherwise non-sensical words (e.g. an e-mail address) that are outside of a typical system dictionary. For these situations the dictionary is useless and under some circumstances using a dictionary may actually impede correct recognition.

In order to address this issue, the inventors provide for two separate areas for handwritten input. The first area is utilized for handwritten text, such as words, while the second area is utilized for handwritten characters (i.e., non-sensical words). When handwritten text is input into the word-entry area, it is treated as handwritten words, and when handwritten text is input into the character entry area, it is treated as handwritten characters.

Regarding claim 1, this claim has been amended to include the limitations that:

- a word entry area in said text input area adapted to receive handwritten words;
- a character entry area separated from the word entry area in said text entry area adapted to receive handwritten characters

Analysis of the prior art reveals that none of the art cited by the Examiner teaches or otherwise suggests the use of two separate handwritten input areas adapted as claimed

by the Applicants. More particularly, the touch screen keyboard area of Dutta fails to teach or otherwise suggest a character-entry area adapted to receive handwritten characters.

In a similar manner, claim 13 was amended to include the step of:

- passing handwritten textual entries made in the word entry area to a handwriting recognition engine to be treated as handwritten words, and passing handwritten textual entries made in the character entry area to the handwriting recognition engine to be treated as characters.

Analysis of the prior art reveals that no prior art teaches or otherwise suggest the recognition of handwritten text as words or characters based on where the input was made. Because of this claims 1 and 13 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding all other claims, since these claims depend from allowable base claims (i.e, claims 1 and 13) all other claims are allowable over the prior art of record.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. As the Applicant has overcome all substantive rejections given by the Examiner the Applicant contends that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's rejections to the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter. Finally, please charge any fees (including extension of time fees) or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502117.

Respectfully Submitted,
Nagel, ET AL.

by: 

Kenneth A. Haas
Reg. No. 42,614
Phone: (847) 576-6937
FAX: (847) 576-3750